



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant: Achintya K. Bhowmik, et al. §  
Serial No.: 10/814,402 §  
Filed: March 31, 2004 §  
For: Single Crystal Electro-Optic Film on §  
Silicon Imager §  
Art Unit: 2873 §  
Examiner: Jessica T. Stultz §  
Atty Docket: ITL.1099US §  
(P18549) §  
Assignee: Intel Corporation §

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF**

In response to the new points raised by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer, the following Reply Brief is submitted.

The Answer makes the following points that the applicant agrees with:

1. The only image that is displayed is displayed on a display means (not shown) that is part of the signal processing unit. See Answer at page 9, last two lines.
2. Claim 1 requires "displaying an image using a second order non-linear electro-optic effect" -- namely, the claim requires that the display use the claimed effect. Answer at page 9, last paragraph.

The following additional points are indisputable:

1. The single processing unit is only described as "a computer or the like." See column 16, lines 30-40.

Date of Deposit: August 20, 2007  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.  
*Cynthia L. Hayden*  
Cynthia L. Hayden

2. The record includes no evidence that "a computer or the like" uses a second order non-linear electro-optic effect.

3. It is irrelevant whether a second order electro-optic effect is used to develop a signal that is then displayed using a computer because the claims include the following limitations:

Claim 1: "displaying an image using a second order non-linear electro-optic effect."

Claim 12: "an imager comprising a second order non-linear electro-optic effect."

Claim 20: "said imager including a second order non-linear electro-optic effect film."

Therefore, the rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2007



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation